DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 098 SO 015 028

AUTHOR Bush, Diane Mitsch
TITLE Victimization at School and Attitudes toward Violence: A Longitudinal Analysis.
PUB DATE Sep 82
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (77th, San Francisco, CA, September 6-10, 1982).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Grade 6; Grade 7; Intermediate Grades; Junior High Schools; Literature Reviews; Longitudinal Studies; Social Science Research; *Student Attitudes; Tables (Data); *Victims of Crime; *Violence

ABSTRACT

A longitudinal study determined whether victimization increases students' fear and distrust and thus leads to greater approval of defensive violence. Data were obtained from a larger study conducted within the Milwaukee schools from 1974 to 1976. The present study utilized data on 221 respondents in grade 6 and on those same respondents when they were in grade 7. Attitudes toward violence were measured by a semantic differential scale; victimization was determined by asking respondents whether anything had been stolen from them and whether anyone had threatened them with violence or beat them up since they entered seventh grade. Criminal victimization had no impact upon the pattern of changes in children's attitudes toward violence from grade 6 to grade 7. Students became somewhat more positive toward defensive violence between the two grades. Victimization had a detrimental psychological effect upon the victim. The conclusion resulting from this study and from a review of relevant research is that adolescents' attitudes are not affected substantially by victimization because of the variety of cultural influences which produce relatively homogeneous attitudes toward violence, social factors which lead to the fear of crime for both victims and nonvictims, and the wide variety of factors (rather than discrete life events) that shape normative evaluations made by adolescents. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED235098

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Diane Mitsch Bush

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

30-3
Monday
September 6
12:30 p.m.

VICTIMIZATION AT SCHOOL AND ATTITUDES TOWARD VIOLENCE: A LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS

Diane Mitsch Bush

A paper prepared for presentation at the 77th Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, September 6-10, 1982 in San Francisco.

Not for reproduction, quotation, or any other use without permission of the author, except for press use after 12:30 p.m., September 6.

SP 015 888

ABSTRACT

Previous research and theory on the impact of criminal victimization upon attitudes toward defensive violence are inconsistent, both within the school context and in society at large. While theory suggests that victims may become more positive toward defensive violence because of the victimization experience, the data are inconclusive. One flaw in prior research is its cross-sectional nature. This research utilizes a longitudinal design, in which change in attitudes toward violence from 6th to 7th grade is compared for victims and non-victims of robbery and theft at school. There is no difference in the pattern of change for victims and non-victims, although both groups become more approving of interpersonal violence as they move from 6th to 7th grade.

Recently, public attention has been focused upon crime and violence in U. S. schools and the potential impact that a school atmosphere of hostility and fear may have upon attitudes of students. The essence of such concerns appears to be the way in which violent schools detract from the education process: "It is an unfortunate but a very real fact of life for a growing number of students and teachers across the country that the primary task in their schools is no longer education, but preservation" (McPartland and McDill, 1977:vii). It is believed that crime in schools leads students to be fearful, while at the same time engendering positive attitudes toward defensive violence as a way of dealing with the crime problem. Although much research has concentrated upon documentation of rising rates of crime in schools (NIE, 1978; McPartland and McDill, 1977; U. S. Congress 1975; Brickman, 1976), little empirical attention has been given to the way in which criminal victimization at school affects attitudes and behaviors of students (see Hepburn and Monti, 1979; Blyth, et al; 1980).

Research on this issue, as well as studies on the impact of criminal victimization on attitudes and behaviors in society generally, is inconclusive. Therefore, the objective of this paper is to explore the link between criminal victimization at school and attitudes toward violence with an eye toward the more general question of how victimization in society at large affects the attitudes and behaviors of victims. To set the stage for this study, first I shall explore theory and research on the impact of criminal victimization in society, showing the inconclusive nature of the findings in this area. Then, I will illustrate the parallels

between problems with this general line of inquiry and the more specialized question of the effects of criminal victimization at school, giving special attention to the way in which victimization experiences might affect attitudes toward violence. Lastly, I will report on research designed to address issues left unanswered by prior work. I will utilize a 2-wave panel design to remedy a major flaw in previous research -- its cross-sectional nature.

Concern with Crime, Fear for Safety, and Restriction of Behavior: Inconsistent Evidence

The growing literature on victimization and fear of crime assumes that public perception of increasing crime leads to generalized mistrust, breakdown of social cohesion and restriction of behaviors because it increases the fear of personal victimization (Wilson, 1975; Conklin, 1975; Erskine, 1974). It is believed that actual victimization experiences exacerbate this process (Viano, 1976; Smith, 1976; Conklin, 1975). However, empirical work casts doubt upon both the notion that fear of personal victimization reduces social cohesion and results in restriction of activities (Hartnagel, 1979; Furstenberg, 1971; Erskine, 1974) and the idea that actual victimization has such an impact upon attitudes and behaviors (Hartnagel, 1979; Savitz et al., 1977; McIntyre, 1967; Hindelang et al., 1978).

Many theorists argue that increases in crime rates lead to generalized mistrust, hostility, and restrictions on individual behaviors and social interactions. However, evidence regarding the relationship between fear of crime, fear for personal safety, and other perceptual or behavioral changes is inconsistent. Wilson (1975) maintains that violent crime tears social bonds apart and reduces social interactions in the community, thereby contributing

to additional violence. Using perception of local crime rates as the independent variable, Conklin (1975) finds that the more individuals fear crime the more they are concerned for their safety and the less trust they exhibit. It appears that individuals reduce social interaction and restrict certain behaviors believed to increase the risk of victimization when they are concerned with high crime rates (McIntyre, 1967; Savitz et al., 1977). Additionally, fear of crime has been shown to result in decreased affect for one's neighborhood (Hartnagel, 1979).

In contrast, several researchers find no relationship between concern with crime and fear for safety (Furstenberg, 1971; Erskine, 1974). Hartnagel (1979) detects no relationship between fear of crime and social cohesion or activity restriction. His data reveal no relationship between perception of high crime rates, social cohesion, affect for one's neighborhood and behavioral restrictions.

Hindelang et al. (1978) provide us with a clue to this puzzle. They assert that respondents in a large scale victimization survey did not seem to view crime as imminent or threatening in their immediate environment even though they perceived it to be a social problem nationally. "Evidently, when people think about crime, they tend to conceptualize it as something that happens 'out there' rather than nearby" (Hindelang et al., 1978:153).

Victimization and Attitudes and Behaviors

The Impact of Victimization

If Hindelang's explanation is indeed accurate, then we would expect the actual experience of victimization to make crime seem more threatening. As Hindelang (1978:167) observes: "The experience of being victimized should

make crime a more personal reality". While not conclusive, the evidence regarding this assertion is predominantly negative (Garofalo, 1977). On the one hand, Ennis (1968) finds that victims are more concerned with safety than are non-victims, and Smith (1976) reports that burglary and robbery victims are more fearful and distrustful, but that victims of beatings report less fear. In contrast, several studies suggest that victimization has little impact upon fear, mistrust, social cohesion, or altered behavior patterns (McIntyre, 1967; Garofalo, 1977; Biderman et al., 1967; Savitz et. al., 1977; Hindelang et al., 1978).[1]

Fear of Crime and Victimization in the School

The concerns voiced regarding the potential effect of rising crime rates and victimization upon social solidarity, mutual trust, approval of violence, and behavioral changes in society at large are reflected in the recent attention devoted to crime and victimization in schools. Parallel to the literature on fear of crime and the effects of victimization in society, investigators have documented rising rates of victimization in schools (NIE, 1978; McPartland and McDill, 1977, Brickman, 1976) and studied correlates of victimization in schools (Blyth et al., 1980; Hepburn and Monti, 1979; Feyerherm and Hindelang, 1974). The assumption that crime and victimization have profound effects upon the individual in society seems to underlie theory on victimization and crime in schools as well.

Evidence on this issue is sparse and, like the research regarding concern with crime and the impact of victimization within the context of the larger society, inconclusive. Feyerherm and Hindelang (1974) find

that among high school students there is no relationship between victimization and fear for safety. However, they did not concentrate exclusively upon the school context, but relied on reports of victimization in a variety of settings. Savitz et al. (1977) discover a positive relationship between fear of crime and restriction of behaviors among teenagers, but they report no relationship between victimization and behavioral restrictions. Hepburn and Monti (1979) examined the relationship between school related victimization, fear of crime, and adaptive responses among high school students. They find moderate positive relationships between fear of crime and adaptive behavior, but little association between fear of crime and victimization. Victimization is positively associated with support for carrying a weapon as an adaptive response and with greater tolerance of delinquent behaviors engaged in by a friend. Some of these behaviors include violence. However, fear of crime does not appear to be the explanatory variable in Hepburn and Monti's study.

In light of the inconclusive evidence regarding the effect of victimization and fear of crime upon attitudes toward violence and adaptive behaviors, it seems that a longitudinal design might be useful. It is possible that data which show a relationship between fear of crime or victimization and attitudes such as affect for one's neighborhood (Hartnagel, 1979), distrust of others, or approval of violence (Smith, 1976; Hepburn and Monti, 1979; Owens and Straus, 1975) reflect attitudes held prior to victimization or to the perception of rising crime. Indeed, the notion that some individuals are victim prone (Hindelang et al., 1978; Amir, 1971) suggests that examining only cross-sectional data to determine the impact of victimization or of the fear of crime on attitudes may be misleading. If we find that children

who experience victimization hold positive attitudes toward violence, we cannot conclude that victimization results in those attitudes. It may be that children who approve of violence are at higher risk for victimization (Wolfgang, 1970; Hindelgang, 1978; NIE, 1978).[2]

Therefore, the current research employs a longitudinal design, tapping children's attitudes at two points in time and comparing children who are victimized in the interim with those who were not. If it is the case that victimization increases fear and distrust, thereby severing social bonds and leading to greater approval of defensive violence, then we would expect victims in our sample to become more positive toward defensive interpersonal violence. We hypothesize that children will remain relatively consistent in their attitudes toward interpersonal violence over the one year period in question, but that those who are the victims of crime may be more likely to change their attitudes toward violence. That change is likely to be a move toward greater approval of defensive interpersonal violence.

Data and Methods

The data analyzed here were collected within the Milwaukee public schools from 1974 to 1976. One concern of the larger study of which the current research is a part was the impact of school structure upon socialization processes, thus schools were sampled from three populations of school types. These were: 1) eighth grade top schools (K-8) which involved no change of school in 7th grade, 2) sixth grade top schools with low proportions of minority students similar to K-8 schools, and 3) the remaining sixth grade top schools (K-6) with high proportions of black students. All K-8 schools were included in the sample, and a random sample of K-6 schools in each

category was drawn. All sixth grade students in the 18 sample schools were asked to participate.

Our initial response rate was 85%; 924 sudents were interviewed in 6th grade. In 7th grade 88% of these respondents were interviewed a second time, yielding a longitudinal sample of 798. For administrative and substantive reasons related to the larger study, the sample was divided into random halves with one interviewed in the fall of 6th and 7th grade and the other interviewed in the spring of 6th and 7th grade. The research reported here is based on a random half of the spring subsample because the attitude items on violence were administered only to this group. Therefore, the panel utilized here consists of 221 respondents at two points in time.

Attitudes toward violence were tapped by two items which require the respondent to indicate whether instances of interpersonal violence between children are "not at all O.K., not really O.K., kind of O.K., or really O.K.". The actual wording of the items is: "If somebody was giving a kid a hard time and that kid hit this other person to make him quit, do you think that would be...", and "If a person was making fun of a kid and the kid hit that person to make them quit, do you think that would be...".

Victimization was measured by asking respondents whether anyone had stolen anything costing more than a dollar from their locker or desk, whether anyone took or attempted to take something from them using or threatening to use force, and whether anyone had beaten them up since they entered 7th grade[3] .

Patterns of changes in attitudes toward violence will be assessed by considering alternative models of attitude change and persistence. The

simplest model allows some individuals to change their minds without changing the distribution of attitudes in the population because changes in one direction are cancelled by equal and opposite changes. An alternative model also posits no net change but allows a variety of shifts that are not limited to equal and opposite offsetting changes. A third alternative allows for net change in attitudes, but constrains the shifts to have a pattern as near symmetry as possible, given that net change. These three alternatives correspond to the log-linear models known as symmetry, marginal homogeneity, and quasi-symmetry (Bishop, et al., 1975; Knoke and Burke, 1980; Duncan, 1979). Models are compared using the likelihood ratio statistic:

$$L^2 = 2 \Sigma f_{ij} \ln (f_{ij}/F_{ij})$$

which is distributed as chi-squared. In addition, the model of independence for the cross-classification of both 6th and 7th grade attitudes by exposure to both types of victimization will be evaluated using maximum likelihood estimates of the chi-squared statistic (L^2). If we reject the model of independence, then we will accept the hypothesis tht victimization does affect attitudes toward violence.

Findings

Table 1 displays the observed response patterns for attitudes toward violence in 6th and 7th grades for victims and nonvictims of robbery - attempted robbery and theft. Results from tests for symmetry, quasi-symmetry and marginal homogeneity are given in Table 2. The test of symmetry for victims of robbery or attempted robbery yields a likelihood

ratio chi-square statistic (L^2) of 13.86 with df=6. For those respondents who were not victims of robbery or attempted robbery the L^2 = 18.08 with df=6. Thus, the hypothesis of symmetry is rejected for both populations, indicating that attitude changes in one direction are not offset by equal changes in the opposite direction. The model of symmetry provides an acceptable fit to the data for theft victims (L^2 = 8.34, df=6), but the symmetry model does not fit the data for non-victims of theft.

Tests for marginal homogeneity are shown in the lower panel of Table 2; chi-square statistics are obtained by subtracting the L^2 for quasi-symmetry from the L^2 for symmetry. The results indicate significant shifts in marginal distributions for attitudes toward violence among all groups except theft victims. Inspection of Table 1 suggests that the changes in attitudes are predominantly in the direction of becoming more approving of interpersonal violence. This appears to be the case for both victims and nonvictims.

However, I have not yet tested whether the pattern of change in the attitudes from 6th to 7th grade is different for victims and nonvictims of both crimes. It is possible that being a victim of both types of crime results in differential attitude change. If victimization has any impact upon attitudes toward violence, cross-classification of the two types of victimization should reveal it. Table 3 shows data for both types of victimization crossed with 6th and 7th grade attitudes and gives L^2's for the hypothesis that victimization is independent of attitude. On the basis of these L^2's we fail to reject the model of independence; victimization has no effect upon attitude nor upon pattern of attitude change.

The failure to detect a victimization effect may be due to small or

zero cell counts in Table 3. Collapsing categories into dichotomies and testing the independence hypothesis using fewer degrees of freedom would address this issue. Indeed it would provide a more stringent test. Table 4 shows response patterns for the crosstabulations of all possible dichotomies for the 6th and 7th grade attitudes by victimization. Table 5 gives the results of tests of the independence model. Only the test for item 2 dichotomized at the midpoint approaches significance.[4] Thus, I conclude for this sample that victimization experiences have no impact upon the pattern of changes in attitudes toward violence.

Discussion

We find that criminal victimization has no impact upon the pattern of changes in children's attitudes toward violence from 6th to 7th grade, and that children become somewhat more positive toward violence between 6th and 7th grade. Both folk and social science characterizations of the victimization process concur that victimization has a detrimental psychological effect upon the victim. Yet, the failure of prior research to uncover a consistent impact of victimization on a wide range of attitudes casts doubt on these descriptions and makes our result seem less surprising. However, we are still left with the question of why the victimization experience has no impact upon attitudes toward violence.

Several explanations for the similarity between victims and nonvictims are plausible. First, it may be that the victimizations reported to us were relatively trivial ones, and thus they had little lasting effect on attitudes. A related explanation comes from previous research on victimization and fear of crime: it may be that victimization experiences have little

impact because attitudes about violence and crime are shaped by a whole constellation of influences rather than one life event. Furthermore, attitudes regarding violence are often seen as an especially important component of American ideology, therefore normative imperatives regarding how one should view acts of violence abound. As a consequence of these strictures, peoples' attitudes toward violence are likely to be somewhat homogeneous regardless of life experiences. Let us consider each of these explanations in greater detail.

Much of the public concern over crime and victimization appears to be a concern over violent street crime and its debilitating effect, both physical and psychological. It is plausible that victims of violent crimes are more severely affected socially and psychologically than victims of property crimes. Evidence on this question is scant, however the association between type of victimization and fear for safety in one's neighborhood offers little support for such a hypothesis. There appear to be either no differences or inconsistent differences in fear for personal safety between victims of violent crimes and property crimes.[5] (Garofalo, 1977:46,60; Hindelang et al., 1978:191).

There is even less evidence on the way in which violent and nonviolent victimization in schools affects students. The largest study of victimization in schools shows that theft victimizations are most prevalent, (NIE, 1978: 58-59) however findings reported in it regarding victimization and attitudes include only violent criminal victimization (robbery and assault) (NIE, 1978: 117-121). Similarly other studies of victimization in schools (Hepburn and Monti, 1979) or research on teenage victimization (Feyerherm and Hindelang, 1974; Mawby, 1979) do not distinguish between

victims of violent crime and victims of property crime when examining the relationship between victimization and attitudes.

It could be argued that the absence of a victimization effect in the study reported here is, indeed, due to the trivial nature of the victimization. However, we find no substantial differences between theft victims or robbery victims.. If we assume that robberies or robbery attempts are more serious than larceny, then this result suggests that seriousness of victimization does not influence the effects of the experience on the victim. Since an undetermined number of the robbery victimizations involve the threat of violence it is possible that a relationship between violent crime and subsequent attitudes is obscured.[6] In order to explore this possibility, it would be desirable to have data which distinguish victims of actual violence from threat victims. We have an exceedingly small sample of assault victims, (N=9) thus we have not reported results for assault victims. However, we have conducted log linear analyses as described above for victims and nonvictims of beatings. Tests for differences in patterns of attitude change between victims and nonvictims reveal no difference (L^2 = 1.97 with 3 df). Even though our findings suggest that the triviality explanation does not account for the similarity between victims and nonvictims, we cannot discard this explanation because of lack of clarity in the robbery indicator and the small sample size for assault victims.

Another interpretation of the similarity of attitude changes comes from prior work on fear of crime[7] and victimization. Victims and nonvictims do not appear to be dramatically different in their levels of fear (Garofalo, 1977; 1979). Instead, Garofalo argues that fear of crime

may be related to social role expectations and media images of crime. Since fear of crime appears to be so pervasive (Hindelang, et. al., 1978; Hartnagel 1979; Garofalo 1979), there is little variance left for victimization experiences to account for. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that most work on victimization is cross-sectional, so it is hard to disentangle the extent to which variation between victims and non-victims is due to the experience of victimization. Indeed it appears that attitudes toward crime are shaped more by social context and prevalent ideology than by actual experience. Our findings are consistent with this assertion.

The strength of this argument is increased by consideration of the content of the attitudes studied here. Attitudes toward crime are tentatively thought to be formed by a whole spectrum of influences from the media to social roles. This view is relatively recent; some observers are convinced that victimization experiences are crucial in shaping attitudes, especially fear and mistrust (Wilson, 1979; Viano, 1976; Parsonage, 1979). Likewise, others argue that there are distinctive life experiences and subcultures involving exposure to crime as a victim or offender, which lead to very distinctive values and attitudes toward violence (Wolfgang, 1970; Yablonsky, 1962). There is evidence against this latter position (Erlanger, 1974; and Erlanger and Winsbnorough, 1976). Others contend that attitudes toward violence are intertwined in history and ideology in America in such a way as to produce relatively homogeneous views (Graham and Gurr, 1979; Blumenthal et al., 1972; Ball-Rokeach, 1974). Consistent with views that attitudes toward violence are superimposed by the

dominant culture, Blumenthal et al., (1972) find that the majority of their respondents approve of instrumental violence done by people with whom they identify. These results point to homogeneity in attitudes toward instrumental violence. (Ball-Rokeach, 1974; Erlanger, 1974; Graham and Gurr, 1979).

It seems reasonable to conclud that adolescents' attitudes toward violence are not affected substantially by victimization because there are a wide variety of cultural influences which produce relatively homogeneous attitudes toward violence just as there appear to be several social factors which lead to a high level of fear of crime for both victims and nonvictims. Furthermore, there is some research which suggests that normative evaluations made by adolescents of behaviors such as violence are shaped by a wide variety of factors rather than by discrete life events. (Biddle et al., 1980; Jennings and Niemi, 1974; Piaget, 1932; Kohlberg, 1964; Schwartz and Schwartz, 1973.)

Summary and Conclusion

We set out to assess the impact of victimization experiences in school upon adolescents' attitudes toward interpersonal violence. Prior research questioned the impact of victimization upon attitudes, while theoretical observations agreed that victimization ought to have pervasive social psychological effects. Since previous studies had been cross-sectional, we utilized a longitudinal design which would allow us to disentangle attitudes held prior to victimization from attitudes subsequent to the experience. Using log-linear analyses to test models of symmetry, quasi-symmetry and modified-quasi-symmetry,

and marginal homogeneity, we find no difference in the pattern of change in attitudes from 6th to 7th grade for victims and nonvictims. There are several plausible explanations for this result. First, we considered the seriousness of victimizations; it is possible that only violent victimizations have a dramatic and lasting impact upon attitudes and behaviors. Next, we suggest that previous work on victimization and crime implies that public opinion regarding fear of crime reflects the dominant view in the media that crime is on the rise and presents a threat to the fabric of society (Gitlin, 1980; Mitford, 1973; Garofalo, 1977; Pepinsky, 1976; Quinney, 1972). Thus, attitudes such as fear of crime, or loss of affect for one's neighborhood are not the products of criminal victimization, but rather they are components of a prevalent ideology. A number of researchers have observed that respondents seem to see the threat of crime as "something out there"; it is a national problem not a local one even for victims. (Hindelang et al., 1978:168). There appears to be a "trend for respondents to perceive crime as less serious as the frame of reference moves closer to themselves" (Garofalo, 1977:25). The findings reported here seem to be a reflection of this process.

Last, we consider the idea that attitudes toward instrumental violence are relatively homogeneous in the U. S. (Blumenthal, et. al., 1972; Ball-Rokeach, 1974; Erlanger, 1974) because they are shaped primarily by a hegemonic ideology and cultural apparatuses such as the media (Gitlin, 1980; Ball and Baker, 1969). Therefore they are somewhat impervious to the impact of particular life experiences such as victimization.

Footnotes

1. Research on rape provides an exception to this generalization. (Katz and Mazur, 1979; Hindelang, el al., 1978).

2. Subculture of violence theories revolve around this process. (Wolfgang and Ferracuti, 1967; Wolfgang, 1970).

3. This item is excluded from most of the analysis here because of the low incidence of beating victims in the sample (N = 9). See below in the discussion section for an analysis using this item.

4. In order to fully explore the relationships between victimization and changes in attitudes toward violence, I constructed change scores for the two attitude variables and regressed them on the two victimization variables. The scores for the change variables range from -3 to 3, with a score of -3 indicating a move from a score of 4 (really O.K.) in 6th grade to a score of 1 (not at all O.K.) in 7th grade and a score of 3 resulting from a score of 1 in 6th grade and 4 in 7th grade. A score of 0 indicates no change. The victimization variables were coded 0 (no victimization) and 1 (victimization).

The regression analyses revealed one significant relationship between attitude change for item 2 ("If a person was making fun of a kid and the kid hit that person to make them quit,...") and theft victimization the unstandardized regression coefficient is .446, the T-value is 2.86; the standardized regression coefficient is .190. None of the other coefficents approached significance.

Given the number of tests run, it is plausible to view this result as a chance occurence. Furthermore, the fact that I get significant findings for only one attitude item and only one victimization item lends credence to this interpretation.

5. Rape victims are the exception; they are much more likely to feel that their neighborhoods are unsafe (Hindelang, et al., 1978:191.

6. This argument assumes that there is a qualitative difference between the threat and the application of violence. This assumption is the topic of a good deal of theoretical debate among students of social power, but there is little empirical work on the issue (Lukes, 1974; Olsen, 1970; Wrong, 1979; Arendt, 1970.

7. Most research on the effects of victimizaiton upon attitudes concentrates upon fear (Garofalo, 1977; Hindelang, et al., 1978; Smith, 1976; Hartnagel, 1979), evaluation of the safety of the respondent's neighborhood (Hindelang, 1978; Hartnagel, 1979), trust (Smith, 1976), or attitudes toward police (Garofalo, 1977; Koenig, 1980).

Table 1

'Attitudes Toward Defensive Violence* in 6th and 7th Grade for Victims and Non-Victims of Robbery and Theft.

	Robbery Victims 7th Grade Attitude Toward Defensive Violence 1					Non-Victims of Robbery 7th Grade Attitude Toward Defensive Violence 1				
6th Grade	1	2	3	4	TOTAL	1	2	3	4	TOTAL
Attitude 1	4	1	2	1	8	14	15	8	7	44
Toward 2	1	4	6	0	11	5	22	19	4	50
Defensive 3	0	0	9	1	10	3	17	20	14	54
Violence 1 4	0	1	1	3	5	0	2	14	23	39
TOTAL	5	6	18	5	34	22	56	61	48	187

	Theft Victims 7th Grade Attitude Toward Defensive Violence 1					Non-Victims of Theft 7th Grade Attitude Toward Defensive Violence 1				
6th Grade	1	2	3	4	TOTAL	1	2	3	4	TOTAL
Attitude 1	3	3	0	3	9	15	13	10	5	43
Toward 2	2	5	8	1	16	4	21	17	3	45
Defensive 3	1	3	7	5	16	2	14	22	10	48
Violence 1 4	0	0	3	8	11	0	3	12	18	33
TOTAL	6	11	18	17	52	21	51	61	36	169

	Robbery Victims 7th Grade Attitude Toward Defensive Violence 2					Non-Victims of Robbery 7th Grade Attitude Toward Defensive Violence 2				
6th Grade	1	2	3	4	TOTAL	1	2	3	4	TOTAL
Attitude 1	3	3	1	0	7	16	8	7	2	33
Toward 2	1	5	4	1	11	12	26	23	5	66
Defensive 3	1	2	7	2	12	2	13	27	14	56
Violence 2 4	1	0	1	2	4	3	1	12	16	32
TOTAL	6	10	13	5	34	33	48	69	37	187

	Theft Victims 7th Grade Attitude Toward Defensive Violence 2					Non-Victims of Theft 7th Grade Attitude Toward Defensive Violence 2				
6th Grade	1	2	3	4	TOTAL	1	2	3	4	TOTAL
Attitude 1	4	3	2	1	10	15	8	6	1	30
Toward 2	2	3	12	4	21	11	28	15	2	56
Defensive 3	0	3	7	4	14	3	12	27	12	54
Violence 2 4	1	0	2	4	7	3	1	11	14	29
TOTAL	7	9	23	13	52	32	49	59	29	169

*Attitude Toward Defensive Violence 1

"If somebody was giving a kid a hard time and that kid hit this other person to make them quit, would that be (1) not at all O.K. (2) not really O.K. (3) kind of O.K. (4) really O.K."

*Attitude Toward Defensive Violence 2

"If somebody was making fun of a kid and the kid hit this other person to make them quit, would that be (1) not at all O.K. (2) not really O.K. (3) kind of O.K. (4) really O.K."

Table 2

Tests for Symmetry, Quasi-Symmetry, and Marginal Homogeneity for Attitudes Toward Defensive Violence.

Model		Attitude 1*			Attitude 1**	
1. Symmetry (robbery victim)	6	13.86	<.05	6	3.99	>.70
2. Quasi-Symmetry	3	5.31	>.10	3	2.62	>.70
3. Symmetry (robbery non-victim)	6	18.08	<.05	6	9.83	>.10
4. Quasi- Symmetry	3	3.43	>.10	3	3.16	<.50
5. Symmetry (theft-victim)	6	8.34	>.20	6	10.82	<.10
6. Quasi-Symmetry	3	4.07	>.20	3	2.89	<.50
7. Symmetry (theft non-victim)	6	18.24	<.05	6	3.26	<.80
8. Quasi-Symmetry	3	2.16	>.30	3	2.22	<.70
Differences-Marginal Homogeneity						
$L^2(1) - L^2(2)$	3	8.55	<.05	3	1.17	<.80
$L^2(3) - L^2(4)$	3	14.55	<.05	3	6.67	<.05
$L^2(5) - L^2(6)$	3	4.30	>.20	3	7.93	<.05
$L^2(7) - L^2(8)$	3	16.08	<.001	3	1.04	<.80

*Attitude 1: "If somebody was giving a kid a hard time and that kid hit this other person to make them quit, would that be (1) not at all O.K. (2) not really O.K. (3) kind of O.K. (4) really O.K."

**Attitude 2: "If somebody was making fun of a kid and the kid hit this other person to make them quit, would that be (1) not at all O.K. (2) not really O.K. (3) kind of O.K. (4) really O.K."

Table 3

Attitudes Toward Defensive Violence in 6th and 7th Grade for Victims and Non-Victims of Theft and Robbery.

Attitude 1: "If somebody was giving a kid a hard time and that kid hit this other person to make them quit, would that be (1) not at all O.K. (2) not really O.K. (3) kind of O.K. (4) really O.K."

Victimization		Grade 6th	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	TOTAL
Robbery	Theft	7th	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
no	no		12	12	8	4	4	18	13	3	2	14	16	10	0	2	11	16	145
no	yes		2	3	0	3	1	4	6	1	1	3	4	4	0	0	3	7	42
yes	no		3	1	2	1	0	3	4	0	0	0	6	0	0	1	1	2	24
yes	yes		1	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	10
TOTAL			18	16	10	8	6	26	25	4	3	17	29	15	0	3	15	26	221

L^2 for Independence in the 4 x 2 table = 37.99, with df = 45, p>.5

Attitude 2: "If somebody was making fun of a kid and the kid hit this other person to make them quit, would that be (1) not at all O.K. (2) not really O.K. (3) kind of O.K. (4) really O.K."

Victimization		Grade 6th	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	TOTAL
Robbery	Theft	7th	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
no	no		12	6	5	1	10	24	14	2	2	10	21	11	2	1	11	13	145
no	yes		4	2	2	1	2	2	9	3	0	3	6	3	1	0	1	3	42
yes	no		3	2	1	0	1	4	1	0	1	2	6	1	1	0	0	1	24
yes	yes		0	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	10
TOTAL			19	11	8	2	13	31	27	6	3	15	34	16	4	1	13	18	221

L^2 for Independence in the 4 x 2 table = 37.31, with df = 45, p>.5

Table 4

Dichotomized Attitudes Toward Defensive Violence in 6th and 7th Grade for Victims and Non-Victims.

Attitude 1: "If somebody was giving a kid a hard time and that kid hit this other person to make them quit, would that be (1) not at all O.K. (2) not really O.K. (3) kind of O.K. (4) really O.K."

Victimization		Grade	(1 → 1)		(2,3,4, → 2)			(1,2 → 1)		(3,4 → 2)			(1,2,3 → 1)		(4 → 2)		
Robbery	theft	6th	1	1	2	2	TOTAL	1	1	2	2	TOTAL	1	1	2	2	TOTAL
		7th	1	2	1	2		1	2	1	2		1	2	1	2	
no	no		12	24	6	103	145	46	28	18	53	145	99	17	13	16	145
no	yes		2	6	2	32	42	10	10	4	18	42	24	8	3	7	42
yes	no		3	4	0	17	24	7	7	1	9	24	19	1	2	2	24
yes	yes		1	0	1	8	10	3	2	0	5	10	8	1	0	1	10
TOTAL			18	34	9	160	221	66	47	23	85	221	150	27	18	26	221

Attitude 2: "If somebody was giving a kid a hard time and that kid hit this other person to make them quit, would that be (1) not at all O.K. (2) not really O.K. (3) kind of O.K. (4) really O.K."

Victimization		Grade	(1 → 1)		(2,3,4 → 2)			(1,2 → 1)		(3,4 → 2)			(1,2,3 → 1)		(4 → 2)		
Robbery	theft	6th	1	1	2	2	TOTAL	1	1	2	2	TOTAL	1	1	2	2	TOTAL
		7th	1	2	1	2		1	2	1	2		1	2	1	2	
no	no		12	12	14	107	145	52	22	15	56	145	104	14	14	13	145
no	yes		4	5	3	30	42	10	15	4	13	42	30	7	2	3	42
yes	no		3	3	3	15	24	10	2	4	8	24	6	2	1	1	10
yes	yes		0	1	0	9	10	10	15	4	13	10	21	1	1	1	24
TOTAL			19	21	20	161	221	74	43	23	81	221	161	24	18	18	221

Table 5. Tests for Models of Independence for Theft and Robbery Victimization by Dichotomized Attitudes Toward Defensive Violence in 6th and 7th Grade.

Attitude 1: "If somebody was giving a kid a hard time and that kid hit this other person to make them quit, would that be . . . (1) not at all O.K., (2) not really O.K., (3) kind of O.K., or (4) really O.K.

Dichotomization	L^2	df	p
(1 → 1) (2,3,4 → 2)	7.30	9	>.5
(1,2 →1) (3,4 → 2)	6.22	9	>.5
(1,2,3 → 1) (4 → 2)	7.46	9	>.5

Attitude 2: "If somebody was making fun of a kid and the kid hit this other person to make them quit, would that be . . . (1) not at all O.K., (2) not really O.K., (3) kind of O.K., or (4) really O.K.

Dichotomization	L^2	df	p
(1 → 1) (2,3,4 →2)	5.94	9	>.5
(1, 2 →1) (3,4 → 2)	15.80	9	.07
(1,2,3 →1) (4→ 2)	6.64	9	>.5

REFERENCES

Amir, Menachem

1971 Patterns in Forcible Rape. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Arendt, Hannah

1970 On Violence. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Ball, Sandra J. and Robert K. Baker

1969 Violence and the Media. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Ball-Rokeach, Sandra J.

1974 "Values and violence." American Sociological Review 38:736-749.

Biddle, Bruce J., Barbara J. Bank, and Marjorie M. Marlin

1980 "Parental and peer influence on adolescents." Social Forces 58(4):1057-1079.

Biderman, Albert, Louise Johnson, Jennie McIntyre, and Adrainne Weir

1967 Report on a pilot study in the District of Columbia on victimization and attitudes toward law enforcement. Field Surveys I. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Bishop, Y. M. M., S. E. Fienberg and P. W. Holland

1975 Discrete Multivariate Analysis: Theory and Practice. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Blumenthal, Monica, Robert Kahn, Frank M. Andrews and Kendra B. Head.

1972 Justifying Violence: Attitudes of American Men. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Blyth, Dale A., Roberta G. Simmons and Diane Bush.

1978 "The Transition into Early Adolescence: A Longitudianal Comparison of Youth in Two Educational Contexts." Sociology of Education 51(3):149-162.

Blyth, Dale A., Karen Smith Thiel, Diane Mitsch Bush and Roberta G. Simmons

1980 "Another look at school crime: student as victim." Youth and Society 11(3):369-388.

Bush, Diane E., Roberta G. Simmons, Bruce Hutchinson, and Dale A. Blyth.

1978 "Adolescent Perception of Sex Roles in 1968-1975." Public Opinion Quarterly 41(4):459:474.

Bush, Diane E. Mitsch

1979 The Legitimation of Violence in Early Adolescence: A Longitudinal Study. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Sociology University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Brickman, W. W.

1976 "Vandalism and violence in school and society." Intellect 104:503.

Conklin, J. E.

1975 The Impact of Crime. New York: MacMillan.

Duncan, Otis Dudley

1979 "Indicators of sex typing: traditional and egalitarian, situational and ideological responses." American Journal of Sociology 85(2):251-260.

1980 "Testing key hypothesis in panel analysis." Pp. 279-289 in Karl F. Schuessler (ed) Sociological Methodolgy 1980. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

1981 "Two faces of panel analysis: parallels with comparative cross-sectional analysis and time lagged association." Pp. 281-318 in Samuel Leinhardt (ed.) Sociological Methodology, 1981. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Easton, David and F. Dennis

1969 Children in the Political System: Origins of Political Legitimacy. New York: McGraw Hill.

Ennis, P. H.

1967 Criminal Victimization in the U. S. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office

Erlanger, Howard S.

1974 "The empirical status of the subculture of violence thesis." Social Problems 22:280-292.

_____ and Winsborough, Halliman H.

1976 "The subculture of violence thesis: an example of a simultaneous equation model in sociology." Sociological Methods and Research 5:231-246.

Erskine, H.

1974a "The polls: fear of violence and crime." Public Opinion Quarterly 38(1):131-148.

1974b "The polls: causes of crime." Public Opinion Quarterly 38(2):288-298.

1974c "The polls: causes of violence and crime." Public Opinion Quarterly 38(3):490-502.

Feyerherm, W. and Michael Hindelang.

1974 "On the victimization of juveniles: some preliminary results." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 11(Jan):40-50.

Furstenberg, Frank F. Jr.

1971 "Public reaction to crime in the streets." The American Scholar 40(4):601-610.

Garafalo, James

1977 "Public opinion about crime: the attitudes of victims and nonvictims in selected cities." Department of Justice-LEAA. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

1979 "Victimization and fear of crime." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 16(1):80-97.

Gitlin, Todd.

1980 The Whole World is Watching: The New Left and the Media. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Graham, Hugh Davis and Ted Robert Gurr (eds).

1979 Violence in America, Revised Edition. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Greenstein, Fred I.

1965 Children and Politics. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hartnagel, Timothy.

1979 "The perception and fear of crime: implications for neighborhood cohesion, social activity and community affect." Social Forces 59(1):176-193.

Hepburn, John R. and Daniel J. Monti.

1979 "Victimization, fear of crime, and adaptive responses among high school students." Pp. 121-132 in Parsonage, Wm (ed) Perspectives on Victimology. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Hindelang, Michael J., Michael R. Gottfriedson and James Garofalo.

1978 Victims of Personal Crime: ·An Empirical Foundation for a Theory of Personal Victimization. Cambridge, Mass: Ballinger.

Jennings, Kent and Niemi, Richard G.

1974 The Political Character of Adolescence. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Katz, Sedelle and Mary Ann Mazur

1979 Understanding the Rape Victim: A Synthesis of Research Findings. New York: Wiley.

Knoke, David and Peter J. Burke.

1980 Log-Linear Models. Beverly Hills; Sage Publications.

Koenig, Daniel J.

1980 "The effects of criminal victimization and judicial or police contacts on attitudes toward local police." Journal of Criminal Justice 8(4):243-249.

Kohlberg, Lawrence.

1964 "Development of moral characteristics and moral ideologies." Pp. 104-162 in H. Hoffman and L. Hoffman (eds), Review of Child Development Research (Volume 1). New York: Sage.

Lukes, Steven.

1974 Power: A Radical View. London: MacMillan.

Mawby, R. I.

1979 "The victimization of juveniles: a comparative study of 3 areas of publicly owned housing in Sheffield." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 16(1):98-113.

McIntyre, J. J.

1967 "Public attitudes toward crime and law enforcement." Annals 374 (Nov.):34-46.

McPartland, James M. and Edward L. McDill.

1977 Violence in Schools: Perspectives, Programs and Positions. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Mitford, Jessica.

1973 Kind and Usual Punishment: The Prison Business. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

National Institute of Education (NIE)

1978 Violent Schools - Safe Schools: The Safe School Report to the Congress. Volume I. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office

Olsen, Marvin E.

1970 Power in Societies. New York: MacMillan.

Owens, David and Murray Straus.

1975 "The social structure of violence in childhood and approval of violence as an adult." Aggressive Behavior 1:193-211.

Parsonage, William H. (ed).

1979 Perspectives on Victimology. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Pepinsky, Harold.

1976 "The growth of crime in the United States." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences 423:23-30.

Piaget, Jean.

1932 The Moral Judgment of the Child. New York: Free Press.

Quinney, Richard.

1972 "Who is the victim." Criminology 10(3):314-323.

Savitz, L., M. Lalli and L. Rosen.

1977 City Life and Delinquency: Victimization, Fear of Crime and Gang Membership. National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, LEAA. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Schwartz, David C.and Sandra K. Schwartz.

1975 New Directions in Political Socialization. New York: Free Press.

Simmons, Roberta G., Leslie Brown, Diane Bush and Dale A. Blyth.

1978 "Self-Esteem and Achievement of Black and White Early Adolescents." Social Problems 26(1):86-96.

Simmons, Roberta G., Dale A. Blyth, Edward F. Van Cleave and Diane Mitsch Bush.

1979 "Entry into Early Adolescence: The Impact of School Structure, Puberty, and Early Dating on Self-Esteem." American Sociological Review 44(6):948-967.

Smith, David Lewis.

1976 "The aftermath of victimization: fear and suspicion." Pp. 203-219 in Emilio C. Viano (ed) Victims and Society. Washington: Visage Press.

Thomas, C. W. and J. M. Hyman.

1977 "Perceptions of crime, fear of victimization and public perceptions of police performances." Journal of Police Science and Administration 5(3):305-317.

Viano, Emilo C. (ed).

1976 Victims and Society. Washington, D. C.: Visage Press.

Wilson, James Q.

1975 Thinking About Crime. New York: Basic Books.

Wolfang, Marvin.

1970 Youth and Violence. Washington, D. C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, U. S. Government Printing Office.

Wolfang, Marvin and Franco Ferraccuti.

1967 The Subculture of Violence. London: Tavistock.

Wrong, Dennis H.

1979 Power: Its Forms, Bases, and Uses. New York: Harper and Row.

Yablonsky, L.

1962 The Violent Gang. London: Collier-MacMillan.